

B R O B D I N G N A G

Broddingnag #48

1966AQ (Fall 1902)

4 November 1966

Game 1966AQ

Fall 1902

RUSSIA EXTENDS AUSTRIAN SALLIENT: VIENNA FALLS
FRANCE RE-CAPTURES BELGIUM. RHINE LINE HOLDS
CONFUSED FIGHTING BUT NO VICTORIES IN BALKANS
POWERS EXCHANGE THREATS BY TELEGRAM

The moves:

FRANCE (Thompson): Army Burgundy supports army Picardy - Belgium. Army Picardy - Belgium. Army Paris - Picardy. Army Gascony supports army Burgundy. Fleet Mid-Atlantic - English Channel.

RUSSIA (Reinsel): Army St. Petersburg - Norway. Fleet Norway - Sweden.
Army Bohemia supports army Galicia - Vienna. Army
Galicia - Vienna. Army Rumania - Budapest. Fleet Black Sea - Rumania.

GERMANY (Nelson): Army Ruhr - Munich. Army Holland - Ruhr. Army Belgium
stands. Fleet Kiel supports fleet Denmark. Fleet
Denmark stands.

AUSTRIA (Duncan): Army Vienna - Bohemia. Army Budapest - Silesia. Army
Serbia - Rumania. Fleet Greece - Aegean Sea. Fleet
Albania - Greece.

ENGLAND (Long): Fleet Barents Sea - St. Petersburg (north coast). Army Finland supports fleet Barents Sea to St. Petersburg.
Fleet Skagerrak - Sweden. Fleet North Sea - Norway.

TURKEY (Greene): Army Bulgaria - Greece. Fleet Aegean Sea - Ionian Sea.
Fleet Smyrna - Eastern Mediterranean. Army Constantinople - Bulgaria.

ITALY (Goldman): Army Venice - Tyrolia. Army Apulia - Tunis. Fleet Ionian Sea convoys army Apulia - Tunis.

Underlined moves do not succeed. The Austrian order to the army in Budapest is illegal as Budapest and Silesia have no common border. The Russian army in St. Petersburg is forced to retreat and has Livonia and Moscow open to it. The German army in Belgium is forced to retreat and has only Holland open to it. The Austrian army in Vienna is forced to retreat and has only Trieste open to it. The player for Russia is to submit a retreat order with the Winter moves. All other powers with Winter moves may make those moves conditional on the direction of the Russian retreat, as retreats occur before builds and removals.

As a result of these moves the belligerent powers control the supply centres listed overleaf.

RUSSIA: Warsaw, Sevastopol, Moscow, Norway, Sweden, Rumania, Vienna.
7 in all. May build 1.

FRANCE: 3 home, 2 Iberian, Belgium. 6 in all. May build 1.

GERMANY: 3 home, Denmark, Holland. 5 in all. No change.

AUSTRIA: Budapest, Trieste, Serbia, Greece. 4 in all. Must remove 1.

ENGLAND: 3 home, St. Petersburg. 4 in all. No Change.

TURKEY: 3 home, Bulgaria. 4 in all. No change.

ITALY: 3 home, Tunis. 4 in all. May build 1.

Deadline for retreats, builds and removals is Tuesday, 22 November 1936.
Builds and removals may be made, if desired, conditional on the one uncertain retreat.

PRESS RELEASES

London, 1 Nov.: The Admiralty today reported the Russian capital was taken after a vigorous seige. Upon hearing this news Prime Minister Treu declared war against Russia. The whole of the British people were infuriated at the Russian occupation of Norway. An all out attempt will be made to liberate the people of Scandinavia from the Russian dogs. The Russians will soon realize what "at all costs" means.

Warsaw, 2 Nov. A state of war now exists between Russia and England. Based on a treaty of 1900 Russia and Germany will now unite against France and England. Russia and Italy are not at war. However, Russia and Turkey are allied against Austria; and Italy is requested to stay out of it if she wishes to survive the holocaust that is coming.

"War is peace", Tsar Charles I was quoted as saying, at the conclusion of the announcement of the declaration of war. Constantinople, 8 Nov. General Bewilderment was cheered wildly when he announced that "England's constant aggressions against our ally, Russia, has forced our government to declare that a state of War exists between England and the Ottoman Empire", (complete pandemonium broke loose at this point) "and may I add, that (cheers)... that Admiral Pazooza's 1st armoured coast defense squadron will be dispatched to the west." (Renewed cheers).

Rome, 10. Nov. The nation of Italy is irrevocably committed to the support of the Austrian government and people. The nation of Italy is united and adamant in its demand that neighbors of Austria leave that nation untrammelled in the pursuit of its peaceful economic development. The nation of Italy will consider itself at war with any country which does not immediately cease attacks upon territory owned by the government of Austria.

Venice, 20 Nov. The VI army Corps has been directed to move northward and occupy the passes of the Tyrolean Alps to defend Vienna and Trieste from possible attack. From whom, is not yet clear.

TELEGRAMS between the powers, intercepted at Geneva:

Ankara to Rome, 5 Sept.: You're back in the game. O. K. The Sultan and the Duke will fulfill Turkey's obligations, if Italy does also. If not by Spring 1903, then war. May the Duke add, A Supply in the hand is worth two in the Minor of Asia.

Ankara to Berlin, 6 Sept. If Italy fails her treaty obligations, would you like some grain from the rich Vienna highlands and the Po valley for your starving peasants in Silesia?

England to Turkey. The dog is ripe.

From the Grand Duchy of Great Zott ((no addressee; apparently broadcast to the world.)). Italy massing on Austria-Hungary with Russia and Turkey as a mass of messy Macedonians mass a messy mass of internal problems. Italian moves aimed at fooling Austria-Hungary; be warned Austria-Hungary.

- - - - -

Game 1966AV.

Spring 1902.

GERMAN FORCES OCCUPY NORMANDY, ALSACE, LORRAINE, AND BURGUNDY
FRENCH FIRST FLEET IN CHANNEL; ITALIAN NAVY MOVES WESTWARD
BAGYARS SEIZE SOPHA AS DUAL MONARCHY PUSHES SOUTH EAST
BATTLE OF CONSTANTIA: TURKISH AND RUSSIAN FLEETS EXCHANGE FIRE

The moves:

GERMANY (Shagrin): Army Berlin to Munich. Army Kiel to Ruhr. Army Munich to Burgundy. Army Denmark stands. Army Belgium to Picardy. Fleet Holland to Belgium.

RUSSIA (Zelazny): Fleet Rumania to Black Sea. Fleet Sevastopol to Rumania. Army Moscow to Sevastopol. Army Ukraine supports fleet Sevastopol to Rumania. Army St. Petersburg holds. Fleet Sweden holds.

AUSTRIA (Munro): Army Serbia to Bulgaria. Fleet Greece supports army Serbia to Bulgaria. Fleet Trieste to Adriatic. Army Vienna to Tyrolia. Army Budapest to Trieste.

ENGLAND (Wells): Fleet English Channel to Mid-Atlantic Ocean. Fleet London to English Channel. Fleet Norway to North Sea. Army Wales stands.

FRANCE (Birsan): Army Burgundy to Marseilles. Army Spain to Portugal. Fleet Picardy to English Channel. Fleet Brest supports Fleet Picardy to English Channel.

ITALY (Francis): Army Piedmont stands. Army Venice to Tyrolia. Fleet Naples to Tyrrhenian Sea. Fleet Tunis to Western Mediterranean.

TURKEY (Lebling): Army Bulgaria to Rumania. Army Armenia to Sevastopol.

Fleet Black Sea supports army Armenia to Sevastopol. Fleet Constantinople to Bulgaria (east coast).

Underlined moves do not succeed. The Turkish army formerly in Bulgaria is dislodged and, having no available retreat, is removed from the board. There are no other dislodgments. Deadline for moves for Fall 1902 is Tuesday, 22 November 1966.

PRESS RELEASES

Constantinople, 12 Feb. (Imperial Turkish New Agency): The Turkish naval forces in the Black Sea (The 1st Fleet and the 2nd Task Force of the 2nd Fleet) won a great victory over their Russian counterparts yesterday. The Russian fleet operating out of Constanta in Rumania and Odessa near the mouth of the Dniester, was ambushed about 60km off the Bulgarian coast by the advance guard of the First Fleet. The Russian fleet managed to get into battle formation, but was severely damaged by fire from the Turkish dreadnoughts. The light cruiser Scutari was sunk by the Russians, but damage to the rest of the fleet was slight. The Russians lost one battleship, four light cruisers, two heavy cruisers and at least one destroyer. The remainder of the Turkish naval forces was in the eastern area of the Sea, supporting the Second Army's drive toward Tiflis, in the Caucasus. There were no reports on the First Army's doings on the Rumanian frontier available for release as yet.

Constantinople, 4 March (ITNA): His Imperial Majesty, Abdul Hamid II, Sultan of Rum, Emperor of Anatolia, Mesopotamia, Syria, Palestine, and Egypt, today adds two new titles to his present ones: King of Bulgaria and Caliph of the Nile. The annexation of the former Kingdom of Bulgaria and of the British protectorate of the Sudan was announced today. It is rumoured that the Sultan would like to add King of Rumania and Czar of all the Russias to his titles. In his address the Sultan declared that "as long as the people of Austria-Hungary recognize the legitimate ambitions of the people of Turkey, as we respect theirs, there can be peace between our peoples, and the imperialism of the Czar can be checked. In answer to those who would have us attack our friends to the west, I can only say that it is fitting that we two, who by all other powers have been bullied and harassed, should grow to greater stature than they had deemed possible."

Paris, 17 March (APR). The propaganda ministry said today that "France extends her ears to any Italian peace talks. And to the English we extend our navy."

WILE DISCUSSION

The latest issue of sTab, #22, (John Woning, 318 South College Vista, Youngstown, Ohio, 44509), contains an excellent summary of the ambiguities, omissions, and contradictions in the rulebook. When, in EROR #44, I published a list of the ambiguities known to me, I intended to follow it up with a series of paragraphs on each of the items listed. John Woning's discussion almost makes that idea superfluous. However, I have decided to go ahead with it anyway; it may add a little historical background to John's remarks, if nothing else. In the meantime, all readers who have any interest in the

details of the rules are urged to read John's article. In almost every case his conclusions are identical with my own.

MONING'S RULE

The rulebook states: "A unit ordered to move, even if unsuccessful, still may cut a support or stand off a single unit, even though its own position is attacked with support and it is consequently dislodged."

The intent of the rule is the following. Germany, for example, has an army in Bohemia and fears a French attack on Munich from Burgundy. Germany plays Bohemia to Munich to stand the attack off. Meanwhile Austria turns on its erstwhile ally, Germany, and plays Vienna to Bohemia, Budapest supporting. The dislodged Bohemian force must retreat, to Silesia, say; but, nevertheless, its abortive move to Munich suffices to stand off the French move. Fair enough.

What, though, if France is not involved and Germany plays Bohemia to Vienna? The attack from Vienna is successful, as before, and the Bohemian force must again retreat. What if Austria also orders army Trieste to Vienna? The literal wording of the quoted section of the rulebook would stand of this latter movement, right through the attacking army which actually dislodged the force.

That the quoted rule was not intended to include this case is shown clearly enough by the example at the back of the book. The move of the English fleet North Sea to Norway in the Fall of 1902, would have been stood off by the Russian move St. Petersburg to Norway. The English move, however, is shown as succeeding, and not stood off, as strict obedience to the quoted rule would require.

In the early days this discrepancy between the main part of the rulebook and the illustrative example in the back of it, was not noted, and every gamesmaster just ruled according to his feeling for the game. In particular, John Boardman, in Graustark #50, Game 1935A, allowed such a follow-in move to succeed, just as is done in the illustrative example. On the other hand, John Smythe, who then published Grantor, in #8 of that journal, ruled in conformity with the literal wording of the text. All of these moves were recorded by the gamesmasters concerned without comment, and it is conceivable that neither of them was aware of the contradiction in the rulebook - no one else was.

The next development occurred in a game in Massif edited by John Moning. Smythe, one of the players in that game, found himself in a position where a "follow-in" move could be made against him. He wanted to be sure that the ruling would be made which would disallow the move and pointed out to Moning his interpretation of the rulebook on the issue. John Moning then made a study of all published games, and of the rulebook, and discovered the discrepancy in previous practice between one gamesmaster and another, and the discrepancy between the body of the rulebook and the example given in it. He published his findings in Massif #5, ruled in favour of the example rather than the law of the rulebook. Moning's rule has been a potent source of argument among Diplomacy players ever since.

Though Moning clearly stated his views in Massif #5, he did not actually formulate a rule. Every magazine using it has had, therefore, to produce its own wording. Something like, "If two forces each attack the space occupied by the other, and if one, by dint of more effective support, dislodges the other, then a third force, attempting to occupy

the space from which the victorious force moves, is not stood off by the abortive attack of the dislodged force." By the way, the name "Woning's Rule" was first applied to this by Charles Wells, similarly for "Brannan's Rule".

Calhauer, the inventor of the game, has several times declared that he had intended to have something equivalent to Woning's Rule in the game, but that it was omitted through an oversight. See his letter in PROB #31, and his more recent article in Diplomacy #12, and in Graustark #100.

Woning's Rule is important for two reasons. First, it is the only instance known of an actual contradiction in the rulebook. As a result discussion of it tends to reveal the speaker's whole philosophy as regards the rules. Secondly, it occurs quite frequently in actual games. Counting over-the-board games, nearly a hundred games of Diplomacy have been published or are in course of publication. Most of the ambiguities which we shall discuss have occurred only once or twice in all those games - some have not yet occurred at all. The Woning's Rule situation, on the other hand, arises quite often. It is, therefore, important to both gamesmaster and player to know how any particular game is being run in this respect.

With all the discussion which Woning's Rule has had since Massif #5 it is perhaps not surprising that many people have formed their opinion on it. As we have seen, Woning made his ruling in the first place largely in order to keep his practice consistent with Boardman's. It is ironic, therefore, that Boardman has recently declared against the rule (Graustark #98, reply to a letter from Woning). Smythe, the original protagonist on the other side, ruled in Game 1964D, stab #2, in a way which indicated that he was then accepting the rule. (Incidentally Game 1964D was also the game in which he had earlier ruled in a sense indicating that he followed the literal wording of the rulebook; so this game does violence to the usual rule that a precedent set in any game, will be adhered to throughout that game.)

Brannan, like Boardman, has changed his stand on the issue, although he, of course, moves in the opposite direction. One of his Wild 'n' Woolly house rules, #7 in the most recent printing (Wild 'n' Woolly #65, page 4), is equivalent to saying that Woning's rule will not be used. However, he has recently indicated (Wild 'n' Woolly #65, page 5) that Woning's rule will be used in his new journal, Malmar.

Charles Wells, at one time a strong supporter of the rule, is now lukewarm in his support of it, although he still uses it (see Lonely Mountain #24). And Woning himself has indicated (Graustark #93) that either interpretation is acceptable to him but that he would like to see uniformity.

PROBING has up to now used Woning's rule. That it would do so was stated at the outset of the current games (PROB #41). As a player I still like the rule and recently, quite unfairly, complained to Brannan for not following it in a game of his that I am in. However, as gamesmaster, the more I look into it, the less I like the rule. The reason for that change of heart will become apparent as this series of articles continues.

Nonetheless, for the duration of the present two games, Woning's Rule will apply in PROB, in accordance with the previous announcement.

(Parenthetically, I might remark that the above would have been

THE FOLLOWING IS A SUMMARY OF THE DISCUSSION, OR SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION.

Boardman, hadn't had the same given name, John.)

Within a short time of Monday's publishing his views in *Masses*, the whole matter was clear to all, or appeared to be. There was a clear-cut contradiction between the main body of the rulebook and the example given in it. Where remained and the question of deciding which side of the argument appeared to be the better. Diplomacy players tended to divide into three camps.

1. The so-called "realists" school. The game of Diplomacy is obviously modeled on the real world, and is based on the power-politics of the period of history in which it is set. Naturally, this reflection of history is somewhat limited by the fact that the smallest unit which can be independently moved is a full army. However, due to allowance being made for that limitation, the reflection is quite close: numbers tell; who gets there first has an advantage over a later arrival; armies cannot be indefinitely maintained without a suitable economic base; and so on. In real life, it is one of the armies routed one of the others, I would not have any difficulty in moving up better equipped units into the position previously occupied by its own victorious army. Therefore this group were those-headed for Monday's rule. (Deak, have I presented the position of this group fairly?)

2. The "intent" school. This group felt that it could be inferred from the illustrative example in the rulebook that something like Monday's rule had been intended in the game. This feeling was later confirmed by several statements from Galtman himself. Members of this group said, in effect, let us play the game as it was intended to be; the omission of the equivalent of Monday's rule was just a slip on the author's part, so let us add it now and carry on. (While it is a fair statement of how I felt, anyhow.)

3. The "rulebook" school. These people felt that the rulebook should be followed, literally, in every instance. Wherefore, Monday's rule, however attractive, must be rejected. Considerations of that kind were the basis of the "intent" school. (Deak, have I presented the position of this group fairly?)

It will be noticed that opponents of the rule did not suggest that its inclusion worsened the game or created new difficulties. Quite the contrary. See for example Galtman's statement in *Masses* #31: "It was my stated opinion that the literal wording of the rules should hold. Nevertheless, I still think 'Monday's rule' makes the game better."

We were in the happy state where everyone knew the rule was good, and yet understood a point of view of those who took a contrary view. One could, quite naturally, lay either version of the game, just as long as one had in advance which it was, the hard state didn't long continue. It was sheltered by Charles's discovery of a contradicting factor. What happens when the quoted force is quoted in its correct on the advance from. With the victorious army advances. The example which originally gave in Monday's rule, it is follows:

RUSSIA: Army Rumania to Bulgaria. Fleet Black Sea supports army Rumania to Bulgaria.
USSR: Army Bulgaria to Rumania. Army Budapest supports army Bulgaria to Rumania. Army Serbia supports army Bulgaria to Rumania. Army Constantinople to Bulgaria.

The underlined move obviously fails and the Russian army in Rumania is routed and must retreat. Without the Black Sea fleet move this would be a simple Honing's Rule situation and would require no comment. With the move of that fleet to follow Honing's Rule and permit the army from Constantinople to enter Bulgaria is to permit an unsupported move which is opposed by a supported move.

Discovery of this case shook Wells' own enthusiasm for Honing's Rule. He continues to use the rule, at least in its simple form but I am uncertain whether he uses the extension or not. Honing, however, does allow the relieving force to come up behind the victor, even though the opposing force is supported. (See slab #22.)

PROBING will follow Honing's Rule, even in the extended case here discussed, for the duration of the present two games. But PROB is very unhappy about the rule, for reasons which will become more apparent in following issues.

- - - - -

For a much more concise discussion of the two topics covered above, please read Honing's article in slab #22.

- - - - -

Two players in PROB games require a few additional players for games which they are organizing. Their journals are:

ag brother, Charles W. Reinsel, 120 3th Ave., Clarion, Penna. 16814.

Prokoria, Dave Rebling, 3 Rollins Court, Rockville, Md., 20852.

- - - - -

One of the painful things about our times is that those who feel certainty are stupid, and those with any imagination and understanding are filled with doubt and indecision.

- Bertrand Russell.

- - - - -

PROBING is a journal of Postal Diplomacy. It reports games 1986.IQ and 1986.IV. A subscription to last until the end of either game may be had for two dollars. Other subscriptions and back issues at 10 cents a copy. It is published and edited by J. A. McCallum, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada.